

REMARKS

In this submission, the specification is amended to correct a typographical error. No amendments are made to any claims.

Objection to the Oath/Declaration

The Office Action objected to the oath/declaration. Applicant submits herewith a substitute oath/declaration, which corrects the alleged defects. Appropriate consent of Assignee and declaration from the Assignee are also submitted herewith.

Initial Comments on Claim Rejections

The Office Action rejected all claims 1-16 and 25 as being based on a defective reissue declaration. This rejection is moot in view of the substitute declaration provided herewith. The undersigned notes, however, that the rejection of claims 1-8 appears misplaced, as these claims were not changed in the reissue application. Nevertheless, as noted above, these rejections are now moot.

The Office Action also rejected claim 15 under both 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103, as being both anticipated by and obvious in view of Korean Publication 20011082990A. These rejections are inconsistent. For example, on page 3, the Office Action states that claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as the use of threads on the bolt is considered to be an obvious matter of engineering choice. Accepting this position of the Office Action, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is misplaced.

Amendment to the Specification

The Office Action indicated that the term “no” in col. 1, lines 40-45 was a typographical error requiring correction. Accordingly, Applicant has amended this portion of the specification to delete this word.

Support for Removal of Hinge Limitation

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office Action states that “the specification refers to the hinge, clearly showing the hinge is a part of the invention.” Applicant notes, however, that the specification discloses various embodiments of the “invention” and not all embodiments require a hinge. For example, the col. 3, lines 41-46 of the specification states:

It is noted that in this embodiment, the first rotating member 22 and the second rotating member 23 are combined together by the bolts, and the hinge 31 and the first rotating member 22 are combined together by the bolts. *However, their combination manner is not limited. For example, they can be combined together by welding.*

That is, this portion of the specification states that the first rotating member 22 and the second rotating member may be combined together by welding, rather than being combined together by the bolts and the hinge. Accordingly, the specification clearly supports embodiments of the invention that do not require a hinge.

Discussion of Substantive Rejections

Claims 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Korean Publication 20011082990A. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons discussed below.

Claim 9 recites a liquid crystal display comprising a base, a first rotating member, and a second rotating member, wherein the first and the second rotating members are disposed in the base in a manner such that the two rotating members rotate together.

In contrast, the Korean Publication discloses a displayer 30, a first rotating element 70, a base 21, and a second rotating element 50, 60. Referring to Fig. 3 of the cited reference, it is clear that the second rotating element 50, 60 is connected to the base 21, and the first rotating element 70 is connected to the second rotating element 60. That is, the first rotating element 70 is not disposed in the base 21. And, the first rotating element 70 is connected to the second rotating element 60 by the bar element 80 so that the first rotating element 70 is not rotating together with the second rotating element 50, 60.

Thus, the Korean Publication fails to disclose that the first rotating member is disposed in the base in a manner such that the two rotating members rotate together. For at least this reason, claim 9 patentably defines over the cited art. Since claim 9 has overcome the rejection, the dependent claims 10-16 define over the reference for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500